



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,228	03/26/2004	Joe Stewart Ramey	571.006	8389

29166 7590 11/15/2005

PERRET DOISE
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3408
LAFAYETTE, LA 70502-3408

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, THOMAS J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3683

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,228

Applicant(s)

RAMEY ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Williams

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 12-21, 25-29 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 12-21, 25-29 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Acknowledgment is made in the receipt of the amendment filed September 19, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2,962,919 to Grundmann et al.

Re-claims 37 and 38, Grundmann et al. disclose a method of engaging a tubular member, comprising: providing a slip device with a first, second and third slip, each slip is provided with a longitudinal slot for receiving a plurality of inserts, each insert has a shoulder cooperating with a ledge located in the slot for transferring a load. The remaining operations are understood in the art and are anticipated by Grundmann et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 3683

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-5, 12-21, 25-29, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grundmann et al. in view of US 6,394,201 to Feigel, Jr. et al.

Re-claims 1-5 and 12-16, Grundmann et al. teach an apparatus for handling a work string or landing string, comprising: a bowl insert and slip means, wherein the slip means comprises a first, second and third slip each with multiple inserts (or dies) with a shoulder 37 that cooperates with a ledge 39 for transferring a load. However, Grundmann et al. fail to teach the tapered angle of each slip outer portion, in particular having an angle greater than 11 degrees relative to vertical.

Feigel, Jr. et al. teach a slip having an outer portion angled greater than 11 degrees, see column 5 lines 6-20, and in particular an angle between 12 and 14 degrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have designed the tapered outer portion of the slips in Grundmann et al. with an angle greater than 11 degrees as taught by Feigel, Jr. et al., thus allowing the slips a greater range of travel. This is taught by Feigel, Jr. et al. as improving the operation of the device, see column 4 lines 65-67 to column 5 lines 1-6. The bowl would have been provided with an angle complimentary to the slip as taught by Feigel, Jr. et al.

Re-claims 17-20, Grundmann et al. teach that the device is for drill pipes as used in the oil industry, see column 1 lines 17-22.

Art Unit: 3683

Re-claims 21, 28 and 29, Grundmann et al. teach a tubular handling device, or rotary slip apparatus, comprising: a first, second and third slip devices 31, each has an arcuate inner and outer face, the first slip has a first longitudinally extending slot 31a, the second slip has a second longitudinally extending slot, and the third slip has a third longitudinally extending slot, each slot has a plurality of ledges 39, a first and fourth insert has a respective shoulder cooperating with a respective ledge (and for transferring a load thereto) in the first longitudinal slot, a second and fifth insert has a respective shoulder cooperating with a respective ledge (and for transferring a load thereto) in the second longitudinal slot, a third and sixth insert has a respective shoulder cooperating with a respective ledge (and for transferring a load thereto) in the third longitudinal slot, the device is provided with a means for connecting the first and second slip and the second and third slip. However, Grundmann et al. fail to teach the tapered angle of each slip outer portion, in particular having an angle greater than 11 degrees relative to vertical.

Feigel, Jr. et al. teach a slip having an outer portion angled greater than 11 degrees, see column 5 lines 6-20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have designed the tapered outer portion of the slips in Grundmann et al. with an angle greater than 11 degrees as taught by Feigel, Jr. et al., thus allowing the slips a greater range of travel. This is taught by Feigel, Jr. et al. as improving the operation of the device, see column 4 lines 65-67 to column 5 lines 1-6. The bowl would have been provided with an angle complimentary to the slip as taught by Feigel, Jr. et al.

Re-claim 25, the ledges have an angle between minus 20 degrees and plus 20 degrees relative to a horizontal plane, as do the shoulders.

Art Unit: 3683

7. Claims 26, 27, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grundmann et al. in view of Feigel, Jr. et al. as applied to claims 21, 25 and 29 above, and further in view of US 6,845,814 to Mason et al.

Re-claims 26 and 35, Grundmann et al. teach that the inserts (or dies) are constructed of bar steel. However, Grundmann et al. fail to teach the inserts made from low carbon alloy steel. Mason et al. teach an insert for a slip made from a low carbon alloy steel material, see column 5 lines 16-17. This would provide a sufficient hardness for the slip insert, thus increasing the lifespan of the insert. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the slip devices of Grundmann et al. as modified by Feigel, Jr. et al. with slip inserts made from a low carbon alloy steel as taught by Mason et al., thus improving the lifespan of the slip insert.

Re-claim 27, Grundmann et al. teach handles 33 associated with the slips, which carry the inserts. As best understood by the examiner the handles claimed are 14, 30 and 48 in the instant invention.

Re-claim 36, the ledges have an angle between minus 20 degrees and plus 20 degrees relative to a horizontal plane, as do the shoulders.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 12-21, 25-29 and 35-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-7128.

Art Unit: 3683

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James McClellan, can be reached at 571-272-6786. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-6584.

TJW

November 9, 2005

THOMAS WILLIAM
PATENT EXAMINER

Thomas William
AU 3683
11-9-05